STETSON LAW REVIEW

VOLUME 36 SPRING 2007 NUMBER 3

INTRODUCTION

THE NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND THE LAW: SUPPORTING THE ROLE OF FORENSIC SCIENCE IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Diana Botluk*

In 1999, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) scrutinized the status and needs of the forensic-science community, concluding that its training needs were "immense."[1] The development of new technology, equipment, methods, and techniques demands that forensic scientists stay up-to-date, necessitating that the forensic-science community broaden its scope of training. NIJ concluded that "[f]orensic professionals need to take advantage of the explosion in information technology and the ability to use it to exchange information and deliver training,"[2] and provided several recommendations.[3] Noted authority on expert testimony and sci-

 Director of Research, National Clearinghouse for Science, Technology and the Law, Stetson University College of Law. J.D., Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law, 1984; B.A., University of Delaware, 1981.

1. U.S. Dept. of Just., *Forensic Sciences: Review of Status and Needs* 4 (Feb. 1999) (available at http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/173412.pdf)).

2. *Id.* at 5.

3. *Id.* at 14–15. Some of the recommendations made by NIJ to alleviate the problems it discovered are as follows:

- The profession should accredit/certify forensic academic training programs/institutions.
- The profession should set national consensus standards of education in the forensic sciences.

entific evidence Carol Henderson, a law professor with previous experience at the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the United States Attorney's Office, assumed leadership in developing a program to meet some of the needs specified by NIJ. The National Clearinghouse for Science, Technology and the Law at Stetson University College of Law (NCSTL) was born. NCSTL became a nationwide organization that provides information-sharing and professional development not only to forensic scientists, but also to lawyers, judges, law enforcement personnel, and the general public.

NCSTL accomplishes NIJ's vision: one-stop shopping for judges, lawyers, scientists, and law-enforcement officials who seek information about the nexus of law, science, and technology. Sponsored by a grant from NIJ, NCSTL offers educational programs and a database of forensic-related information. Within the context of the promotion of justice based on sound science and technology, NCSTL focuses on raising awareness and fostering communication and understanding among the various parties interested in scientific evidence and expert testimony.

The relationship between law, science, and technology has been called both an "essential alliance" and a "reluctant embrace."[4] Failure to meet the needs of the forensic-science community results in inefficiency throughout the criminal justice system and impacts the public at large, which is disserved by such inefficiency on many levels. NCSTL's many activities embrace the needs of the forensic-science community enumerated by NIJ.

. . .

- All forensic scientists should have formal expert witness training.
- The profession should provide end user training to [police, the bar, the judiciary, the general public, and policymakers].
- The profession should make a concerted effort to compile databases for literature, reference materials, and analytical data.
- The profession should utilize existing and explore other delivery systems for forensic science training.

. . .

- Computer-interactive training materials should be developed for forensic science.

Id.

4. Consider the titles of the following works: Steven Goldberg, *The Reluctant Embrace: Law and Science in America*, 75 Geo. L.J. 1341 (1987); *Science & Law: An Essential Alliance* (William A. Thomas ed., Westview Press 1983).

Judges, lawyers, scientists, and law-enforcement personnel can be overwhelmed by some of today's challenges relating to scientific and technological evidence. A constant influx of new information is always a challenge. The administration of justice requires lawyers and scientists alike to keep current with new scientific technologies. The more advanced the science, the better the chances that justice can be achieved at trial. Additionally, the administration of justice is impacted by less-than-perfect quality in evidence collection or analysis. In other situations, blatant unethical behavior, such as fraudulent expert testimony, challenges justice.

The effective presentation of valid expert testimony and scientific evidence at trial is yet another challenge faced by both lawyers and scientists. Judges must be effective gatekeepers of such evidence, making decisions about what is valid,[5] as opposed to "junk" science.[6] Moreover, the recent phenomenon known as the "CSI Effect" presents a challenge in educating jurors to overcome their unrealistic expectations.[7] NCSTL provides many programs and services designed to help cope with all of these challenges.

Keeping up-to-date in a rapidly changing world replete with information overload is not an easy task. Yet justice requires reliance upon the latest, newest scientific information and technologies. Lives can literally be at stake. As technologies develop, reexaminations of some cases have led to exonerations of innocent persons wrongly convicted and imprisoned for crimes they did not commit.

The most visible examples are the 181 exonerations achieved since the inception of the Innocence Project in 1992.[8] As the sci-

5. In *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993), the United States Supreme Court established that trial judges have a screening or gatekeeping responsibility to "ensure that any and all scientific testimony or evidence admitted is not only relevant, but reliable." *Id.* at 589.

6. *See* Kenneth R. Foster & Peter W. Huber, *Judging Science: Scientific Knowledge and the Federal Courts* 17 (MIT Press 1999) (defining junk science as "when a witness seeks to present grossly fallacious interpretations of scientific data or opinions that are not supported by scientific evidence" and identifying it as a "legal problem . . . cultivated by the adversarial nature of legal proceedings").

7. For further discussion of the CSI Effect, see *infra* notes 44–50 and accompanying text.

8. Innocence Project, *Innocence Project*, http://www.innocenceproject.org (accessed July 10, 2006).

ence of DNA became more sophisticated, it became more and more determinative in establishing guilt or innocence. Only taking on cases where post-conviction DNA testing concluded that innocence was irrefutable, the Innocence Project set out to use the latest scientific developments to achieve greater justice where exonerations were deserved.[9] Factors that led to the initial wrongful convictions were usually less science-oriented and overwhelmingly included cases of mistaken identity.[10] Had the latest DNA science not been applied, these 181 innocent persons might still be in prison or even executed.

In addition to new scientific breakthroughs, scientific practices that were once considered valid in helping determine guilt or innocence can be reexamined and found problematic. In 2005, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) discontinued its practice of comparative bullet lead analysis.[11] The FBI Crime Lab had been the only crime laboratory in the nation to perform this expensive test, which was said to match bullets by comparing their chemical composition.[12] It had used the technique in about 2,500 cases since the early 1980s with approximately 500 of those test results presented in court.[13] The National Research Council, an arm of the National Academy of Sciences, released a report in 2004 that raised doubts about the way the technique is used.[14] While bullet fragments can be matched to bullets to prove that they both originated from the same batch of molten lead, one batch of lead might be used to produce up to thirty-five million bullets.[15] The report criticized the use of "chaining," a process whereby analysts compared bullets from the same box to each other and drew conclusions about their similarities.[16] In 2005, the Appellate Division of

9. *Id.* at http://www.innocenceproject.org/about.

10. *Id.* at http://www.innocenceproject.org/causes. The breakdown of factors that led to the first 130 exonerations included: 101 mistaken-identity cases, 35 false-confession cases, 21 cases involving informants or snitches, 21 cases involving microscopic hair comparison matches, and 3 DNA inclusions at the time of trial. *Id.* A single case may have been influenced by more than one factor. *Id.*

11. Eric Lichtblau, *F.B.I. Abandons Disputed Test for Bullets from Crime Scenes*, N.Y. Times A12 (Sept. 2, 2005).

12. *Id.*

13. Dan Eggen, *Study Faults FBI Bullet Tests; Analysis of Lead Called Inconsistent; Court Challenges Expected*, Wash. Post A12 (Feb. 11, 2004).

14. *Id.*

15. *Id.*

16. *Id.*

the New Jersey Superior Court referred to expert testimony about composition bullet lead analysis as "based on erroneous scientific foundations" and reversed a conviction that had been based on that testimony.[17] In its opinion, the court referred to a study commissioned by the FBI which concluded that there was "no reliable measure of the probability of a coincidental match."[18]

Even fingerprint evidence, with its long history of dependability, has been subjected to recent challenges. After a fingerprint found on a bag from the 2004 Madrid train bombing was erroneously matched to Oregon attorney Brandon Mayfield,[19] the subjectivity inherent in fingerprint matches was called into question. While fingerprints themselves are seen as unique, matches may be subject to "irrelevant and misleading contextual influences."[20] Consequently, fingerprints are not as infallible as once thought. The FBI issued a statement saying that it is reviewing its practices and considering adoption of new guidelines "for all examiners receiving latent print images when the original evidence is not included."[21]

Thus, keeping current with the latest scientific and technological information is vitally important to the administration of justice. It is important to remember that for every innocent person convicted, a criminal roams free. Wrongful conviction is not only a personal tragedy for the accused, but also a tragedy for society as a whole. Society loses not only from the denigration of the civil rights of the innocent, but also from the tangible danger of a criminal on the loose.[22] Nevertheless, in today's vast expanse of

17. *State v. Behn*, 868 A.2d 329, 331 (N.J. Super. App. Div. 2005), *cert. denied*, 874 A.2d 1104 (N.J. 2005).

18. *Id.* at 337; *see also* Robin Mejia & Ian Sample, *Bite the Bullet: Prosecutors Need to Get the Facts on Firearms Straight, before Innocent People End Up in Jail*, 174 New Scientist 4 (Apr. 20, 2002) (noting that the study found that "while it is theoretically possible to determine the likelihood of a match, the FBI didn't have enough data to do it").

19. Sarah Kershaw & Eric Lichtblau, *Bomb Case against Lawyer Is Rejected*, N.Y. Times A16 (May 25, 2004).

20. Itiel E. Dror, David Charlton & Ailsa E. Péron, *Contextual Information Renders Experts Vulnerable to Making Erroneous Identifications*, 156 Forensic Sci. Intl. 74, 76 (2006) (available at http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~id/FSI%20contextual%20influences.pdf).

21. FBI, Press Release, *Statement on Brandon Mayfield Case* (May 24, 2004) (available at http://www.fbi.gov/pressrel/pressrel04/mayfield052404.htm).

22. *See e.g.* Fred Grimm, *When Justice Fails, Innocents Pay Price*, Miami Herald 5B (June 8, 2003) (demonstrating the tragic consequences of allowing a criminal to remain free after an innocent person is wrongfully convicted).

information overload, keeping current can prove to be a real challenge. NCSTL's unique concept of one-stop shopping for legal, scientific, and technological information directly battles these challenges of information overload and keeping up-to-date.

One of the primary purposes of NCSTL is to provide a resource that collects and tracks the latest available sources related to forensics and technology. NCSTL scrutinizes and disseminates useful information in the form of a research database on the Internet that is free and available to the public.[23]

"The National Clearinghouse for Science, Technology and the Law database is the most exciting new development for the law enforcement and forensic science communities in years," said Dr. Henry C. Lee, who has used the database in his class.[24] Lee is one of the world's foremost forensic scientists and star of Court TV's *Trace Evidence: The Case Files of Dr. Henry Lee*.[25]

The NCSTL database was first offered live to the public in February 2005. It collects and distributes bibliographic information on thousands of court decisions, pieces of legislation, legal and scientific publications, news and media features, websites, and educational opportunities. Using the database, researchers can choose to view all types of resources in all its forensic-related topics or can restrict the search to those topics or resource-types of specific interest. Individual records provide bibliographic information as well as active URLs that link to full text whenever available. Researchers can also take advantage of a feature that offers the ability to save favorite searches. Materials found in the database are catalogued in hard copy in the NCSTL collection at the Stetson University College of Law Library.

In addition to providing access to research resources, NCSTL's annual National Conference on Science, Technology and the Law brings together judges, lawyers, scientists, and law-enforcement personnel to share information about the latest topics in forensic science and technology as they relate to the criminal justice system. This conference examines the newest informa-

23. *See generally* NCSTL, http://www.ncstl.org (last accessed Oct. 30, 2006).

24. Stetson U. College of L., Press Release, *National Clearinghouse for Science, Technology and the Law at Stetson Launches Leading Scientific Database* (Mar. 8, 2006) (available at http://www.law.stetson.edu/Communications/news.asp?id=159).

25. *Id.*

tion available as well as provides training workshops in forensic science and law.[26]

The 1999 NIJ report stressed the need for better forensic-science training, again with the efficient administration of justice as the overall goal.[27] Lack of training and supervision can lead to a breakdown of procedures in handling scientific evidence. That, in turn, can lead to the necessity of re-examining many cases.

One of the most notorious examples is the story of the Houston Police Department Crime Laboratory (HPD Crime Lab). In 2002, KHOU-TV in Houston aired a series of investigative news reports that criticized the HPD Crime Lab's DNA/Serology Section.[28] After the City determined that further investigation was necessary, Washington, D.C. attorney Michael Bromwich's team of lawyers and forensic scientists was selected to perform an independent investigation of the irregularities in the laboratory.[29] The team found systemic problems, such as a lack of adequate support from the City and a lack of supervision and leadership.[30] The Independent Investigator reviewed 2,300 cases that had been analyzed in the HPD Crime Lab between 1980 and 2002. As of May 2006, the team had found ninety-three cases, including four

26. In 2005, the conference examined the following topics: The CSI Effect and the Impact of News Coverage on High Profile Cases; Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Cybercrime Cases; Investigation of Abuse: Use of Science, Technology, and Law in Detection and Resolution; Ensuring Accuracy and Reliability in Science and Technology; Making Sure Science Serves Justice: The Case of the Houston Police Department Crime Lab; Balancing Information Sharing and Privacy Concerns; Emerging Legal Issues with Science and Police Investigation Tools; and Impact of New Technologies on the Criminal Justice System. National Conference on Science, Technology and the Law (St. Petersburg, Fla., Sept. 12–14, 2005) (copy of schedule on file with *Stetson Law Review*). In 2006, the conference explored the following topics: Identity Theft; Forensic Psychology; Science, Law and Law Enforcement of Methamphetamine; Biogeographical Ancestry Prediction Based on DNA; Fingerprint Evidence Update; Less than Lethal Technologies; and Forensic Evidence Case Law Developments. It will also see the addition of pre-conference workshops in Intra- and Interstate Tracking of Sexual Predators, DUI Standards—Toxicology and Behavioral Models, and Presenting Forensic Evidence in Court. National Conference on Science, Technology and the Law (St. Petersburg, Fla., Nov. 2–5, 2006) (copy of schedule on file with *Stetson Law Review*).

27. U.S. Dept. of Just., *supra* n. 1, at 4.

28. Off. Indep. Investigator for the Houston Police Dept. Crime Laboratory & Prop. Room, *Background of the Investigation* ¶ 1, http://hpdlabinvestigation.org/about.htm#From%20Home (accessed Jan. 19, 2007).

29. *Id.* at ¶ 5.

30. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP, Press Release, *Independent Investigator Issues Third Report on Houston Police Department Crime Lab* (D.C., June 30, 2005) (available at http://hpdlabinvestigation.org/pressrelease/050630pressrelease.pdf).

capital cases, where there were doubts about the reliability and validity of results and conclusions.[31] NCSTL welcomed Bromwich as a special guest speaker at its 2005 conference, where he captivated the audience with tales of the HPD Crime Lab investigation.

In other continuing-education efforts, NCSTL tries to raise awareness of the nature of good evidence practices. NCSTL presents an annual lecture series on the Stetson University College of Law campus about a wide variety of forensic topics, including forensic investigations.[32] Noted forensic scientists, such as Drs. Michael Baden[33] and Henry Lee[34] have presented in the series. In fact, one of Dr. Baden's lectures for NCSTL included displaying photographs of the Nicole Simpson murder scene, complete with pictures of officers' footprints in blood scattered about the scene.[35] Part of Dr. Lee's lecture included a discussion of securing a crime scene.[36] Thus, through its continuing-education efforts, NCSTL shares with the forensic-science community and the public what good forensic-science practices are. NCSTL's lecture series is not only free and open to the public, but is also webcast and podcast live, as well as available archivally from the NCSTL website.[37]

Besides raising awareness of good evidence-collection procedures through lectures, NCSTL also helps to meet the challenge of improving forensic techniques through its Law Enforcement Evidence Policy Review & Integration Project. This project, in its initial stages in Florida, is co-administered with the National Fo-

31. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP, Press Release, *Independent Investigator Issues Fifth Report on Houston Police Department Crime Lab* (D.C., May 11, 2006) (available at http://hpdlabinvestigation.org/pressrelease/060511pressrelease.pdf).

32. Other lectures presented on the Stetson University College of Law campus include: Helena Ranta, *Forensic Investigations of Human Rights Violations in Kosovo* (Feb. 12, 2004); Cyril Wecht, *Forensic Medicine Odyssey: From the Kennedy Assassination to the Scott Peterson Case* (Feb. 11, 2005); Maria Corazon A. De Ungria & Chris Asplen, *The Impact of DNA Evidence in Addressing Human Rights Issues in the Philippines and Other Uses of DNA Worldwide* (Jan. 23, 2006); James Young, *Terrorists, Hurricanes and Viruses: What's Next?* (Mar. 13, 2006).

33. Michael Baden, Speech, *The Complete History of Murder and Science in One Hour* (Stetson U. College of L., Jan. 29, 2004); Michael Baden & Peter Dean, Speech, *Forensic Pathology on Both Sides of the Pond* (Stetson U. College of L., Apr. 4, 2005).

34. Henry C. Lee, Speech, *New Advances in Forensic Science* (Stetson U. College of L., Mar. 15, 2004).

35. Baden, *supra* n. 33.

36. Lee, *supra* n. 34.

37. NCSTL, *supra* n. 23, at http://ncstl.org/education.

rensic Science Technology Center. The purpose of this project is to support law-enforcement efforts by conducting an objective review of existing evidence policies and procedures and providing recommendations to improve effectiveness. Law-enforcement agencies will be provided with a model evidence policy that integrates the collective knowledge of NIJ's previous research on "best practices" into a tangible, ready-to-use tool. Participating agencies can expect to see a reduction in the number of cases that result in dismissals or acquittals as a consequence of missed, improper, or insufficient evidence collection.

While one possible result of a lack of sufficient forensic-science training can be sloppy practices at the scene or within the laboratory itself, it may not stop there. A situation can go from bad to worse when a scientist decides to lie in reports or on the witness stand.

For example, Fred Zain, former Chief of Serology at the West Virginia Division of Public Safety, had his entire career's worth of work called into question when an official investigation revealed irregularities in most cases where his work was reviewed. His misconduct included such atrocities as reporting inconclusive results as conclusive, repeatedly altering laboratory records, and implying a match with a suspect when testing supported only a match with the victim.[38] In fact, many states besides West Virginia have struggled with unscrupulous laboratory scientists, including Florida, where blood and DNA specialist John Fitzpatrick was found to have switched DNA samples and changed test data.[39] Even the cream of the crop, the FBI laboratory, has encountered these issues. In 2001, it was revealed that Jacqueline Blake, a former laboratory worker in the FBI's DNA unit, failed to perform control tests in over 100 cases,[40] and, in 2002, FBI labo-

38. *In re Investigation of the W. Va. St. Police Crime Laboratory, Serology Div.*, 438 S.E.2d 501, 516 (W. Va. 1993).

39. Rene Stutzman, *Crime-Lab Worker Puts Cases in Doubt; FDLE Analyst in Orlando Altered a Test Case, Casting Suspicion on All His Findings*, Orlando Sentinel A1 (July 19, 2002).

40. Dan Eggen, *FBI Laboratory Moves to New Home: Quantico Facility Opens Today*, Wash. Post A21 (Apr. 25, 2003); John Solomon, *New Allegations Target DNA, Bullet Analysis at FBI Crime Lab*, Orlando Sentinel A3 (Apr. 16, 2003); Richard Willing, *Mueller Defends Crime Lab after Questionable DNA Tests*, USA Today 3A (May 1, 2003).

ratory scientist Kathleen Lundy admitted lying during testimony.[41]

Lawyers should independently assess scientific evidence, but valid science may not always be easy to spot, especially when the possibility of unethical experts exists. Additionally, it has been noted by some studies that judges, as the gatekeepers of scientific evidence, cannot always tell the difference between real and "junk" science.[42] When an independent assessment is made, it is easier to spot the breakdowns in an expert's description of standard operating procedures or ethics.

NCSTL can help lawyers and judges gain a better grasp of science for an independent assessment and view scientific information from a legal perspective. Lawyers can use the NCSTL database to find scientific information for themselves, as well as to find information about scientific experts or to locate experts that have written or spoken about certain scientific topics. NCSTL's conferences and lectures help to educate judges and lawyers about the roles scientists play in the criminal justice system.

Although judges' and lawyers' perceptions of scientific evidence are a challenge for the effective use of that evidence at trial, juror perceptions are an even bigger challenge. Studies have shown that expert testimony has a significant impact on the outcome of a trial.[43] In recent years, the criminal justice system has experienced a new, growing phenomenon known as the CSI Effect, where jurors harbor unrealistic expectations of scientific evidence based on what they view in television crime dramas.[44]

Many lawyers have had a brush with the CSI Effect while at trial. United States District Judge Reggie Walton recalls a particularly egregious example from his courtroom, where the ac-

41. Eggen, *supra* n. 40; Solomon, *supra* n. 40.

42. Julie Kay, *No Scientific Method: Florida Judges Can't Tell the Difference between Expert Testimony and Junk Science, According to New Study by FIU Professor*, 41 Broward Daily Bus. Rev. B1 (Aug. 11, 2000); Margaret Bull Kovera & Bradley D. McAuliff, *The Effects of Peer Review and Evidence Quality on Judge Evaluations of Psychological Science: Are Judges Effective Gatekeepers?* 85 J. Applied Psych. 574 (2000); Sophia I. Gatowski et al., *Asking the Gatekeepers: A National Survey of Judges on Judging Expert Evidence in a Post-Daubert World*, 25 L. & Human Behav. 433 (2001); Jane Campbell Moriarty & Michael J. Saks, *Forensic Science: Grand Goals, Tragic Flaws, and Judicial Gatekeeping*, 44 Judges J. 16, 29 (2005).

43. Joan M. Cheever & Joanne Naiman, *The View from the Jury Box: Expert Witnesses Found Credible by Most Jurors*, Natl. L.J. S4 (Feb. 22, 1993).

44. Kit R. Roane, *The CSI Effect*, U.S. News & World Rpt. 48 (Apr. 25, 2005).

cused was on trial for weapons possession. Police officers observed the weapon on the accused and removed it from his possession to ensure their safety while making the arrest. At trial, jurors wanted to know why there was no test performed to examine DNA on the firearm and why the officers destroyed the weapon's fingerprint evidence by handling it even though the answers to these questions were irrelevant to proving the possession charge. Consequently, the accused was acquitted.[45] Judge Walton's story is but one example of a quickly growing number of CSI Effect tales being reported throughout the country.[46] Additionally, studies of attorneys in Florida and Arizona, conducted to examine the impact of the phenomenon, concluded that the CSI Effect has made a difference in the way attorneys approach trials.[47]

Several of NCSTL's activities examine the CSI Effect. At the 2005 American Bar Association (ABA) Annual Meeting, NCSTL and the ABA Section of Science and Technology Law presented a special plenary session entitled "CSI Meets the Courts: The Brave New World of Forensic Technology."[48] Besides NCSTL staffers and advisory council members, the session featured forensic VIPs Michael Baden and Cyril Wecht as well as United States District

45. Interview with Hon. Reggie Walton, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (May 11, 2006).

46. For a list of other resources related to the CSI Effect, see NCSTL, *supra* note 23, at http://ncstl.org/education/CSI%20Effect%20Bibliography.

47. A study conducted by Michael Watkins of Florida State University surveyed fifty-three prosecutors and defense attorneys and found that seventy-nine percent felt that forensic crime dramas created unrealistic expectations in jurors and fifty-five percent asked potential jurors if they watched those crime dramas. Michael J. Watkins, *Forensics in the Media: Have Attorneys Reacted to the Growing Popularity of Forensic Crime Dramas?* 59, 61, 67 (unpublished paper, Aug. 3, 2004, Fla. St. U.) (available at http://www.coolings.net/education/papers/Capstone-Electronic.pdf). Twenty-one percent of the prosecutors and seventeen percent of the defense attorneys struck potential jurors who were fans of such dramas. *Id.* at 68. Twenty-five percent of the prosecutors and ten percent of the defense attorneys reported an experience with a juror who held a skewed impression. *Id.* at 64.

Additionally, a study conducted by the Maricopa County Attorney's Office in Arizona surveyed 102 prosecutors and concluded that thirty-eight percent believed that they had at least one trial that resulted in an acquittal or a hung jury where there was sufficient non-forensic evidence to convict, and seventy-two percent believed that jurors with "expertise" from television shows influence other jurors who do not watch such shows. Maricopa Co. Atty.'s Off., *CSI: Maricopa County: The CSI Effect and Its Real Life Impact on Justice* (June 30, 2005) (available at http://www.maricopacountyattorney.org/Press/PDF/CSIReport.pdf).

48. ABA, Program Book, ABA Annual Meeting (Chi., Ill., Aug. 6, 2005) (available at http://www.abanet.org/annual/2005/programbook.pdf).

Court Judge Andre Davis and *CSI: Miami* writer Dean Widenmann. Some of the educational materials from this session are available on NCSTL's web site.[49]

NCSTL has raised awareness of the CSI Effect through a variety of methods beyond the ABA program. Many of NCSTL's outreach efforts, through media appearances, articles, and conference sessions, have concerned the CSI Effect.[50] Additionally, NCSTL's conferences have addressed this phenomenon through sessions about the impact of the media on high profile cases and presenting forensic evidence in court.

As NCSTL looks to the future, it will continue examining the latest trends and issues involving forensic science, technology, and law and disseminating information and educational opportunities to the legal and scientific communities and to the public. To keep up with the latest news and activities, be sure to visit NCSTL online at www.ncstl.org.

49. NCSTL, *supra* n. 23, at http://www.ncstl.org/education.

50. For a list of NCSTL's accomplishments, see NCSTL, *supra* note 23, at http://ncstl.org/about/Accomplishments.